

8 May 1958

MEMORANDUM FOR: OGC Personnel

SUBJECT: Telephone Security

At the May Senior Staff Meeting General Cabell spoke of his concern about discussion of classified matters over the telephone. He said it had been his personal observation that many people started discussing matters with him with carefully devised double talk but that as the discussion proceeded they seemed completely to forget such precautions. He felt it was time for another reorientation of this subject and asked that all employees be reminded that classified information is not to be passed over the telephone. Almost inevitably we all have to transact a certain amount of business over the telephone involving classified matters, but if it cannot be referred to in such terms that the classified aspects are protected we must accept the delay required for personal contact.

STA

LAWRENCE R. HOUSTON  
General Counsel

Approved For Release 2004/05/12 : CIA-RDP62-00631R000400050013-0

STAT

Approved For Release 2004/05/12 : CIA-RDP62-00631R000400050013-0

1 MAY 1958

Mr. Phineas Indritz, Counsel  
Public Works and Resources Subcommittee  
Committee on Government Operations  
House of Representatives  
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear Mr. Indritz:

In our telephone conversation you indicated that in a letter of 25 April 1958 Captain Carlton R. Adams, Office of the Secretary of Defense, had indicated that any use of a report entitled, "Soviet Research on the De-Salting of Water," should be coordinated with this Agency. This report when prepared was stamped "For Official Use Only," which restriction was properly still on the paper when submitted to you. This is not a security classification, as the paper does not contain confidential information relating to the national defense. It is, however, a paper which was written for a special purpose and without opportunity to do the type of study and research which would be desirable in a finished report. We, therefore, believe it would be wise to publish it openly as a Central Intelligence Agency report, both because it is not completed work and because it might be taken as indicating the scope of knowledge of the subject or the lack thereof.

If, however, all attribution to this Agency and to any office within the Agency, and if reference numbers and the stamp "For Official Use Only" were removed, we have no objection to incorporating this document into open file as a document submitted by representatives of the Department of Defense in the course of their testimony before the Subcommittee.

Very truly yours,

OGC:LRH:jeb

cc: OSI

Legislative Counsel

General Counsel-chrono-no cir Lawrence R. Houston

subject-Security General Counsel

STAT

SENDER WILL CHECK CLASSIFICATION TOP AND BOTTOM			
UNCLASSIFIED		CONFIDENTIAL	
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP			
TO	NAME AND ADDRESS	INITIALS	DATE
1	<b>Acting AD/SI 145 Barton</b>		
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
ACTION		DIRECT REPLY	PREPARE REPLY
APPROVAL		DISPATCH	RECOMMENDATION
COMMENT		FILE	RETURN
CONCURRENCE		INFORMATION	SIGNATURE
STAT			
Remarks: <span style="border: 1px solid black; display: inline-block; width: 100px; height: 1.2em; vertical-align: middle;"></span> The attached copy of a letter to Mr. Indritz should, I believe, take care of the report on de-salting of water. If there is no attribution to the Agency it is my understanding you would not be bothered by publication. The Subcommittee may not use it in the end. Your analysts may not agree with the sentence that this report did not have the type of study and research desirable in a finished report. However, Mr. Indritz wanted us to say this so he could explain to the Subcommittee why the "Official Use Only" stamp was used. Also, he said the Sub- <div style="text-align: right;">(over)</div>			
FOLD HERE TO RETURN TO SENDER			
FROM: NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NO.			DATE
<b>General Counsel 221 East</b>			<b>5/1/58</b>
UNCLASSIFIED		CONFIDENTIAL	SECRET

committee had already been given information on Russian de-salting experiments, particularly some stories that appeared in THE NEW YORK TIMES about tests which, I believe, had been undertaken in Turkistan. He said the <sup>Sub</sup>committee noted that our report did not contain the information given in the TIMES stories and had commented that our report must, therefore, not be based on all available information. You may want to discuss this with your analysts as to whether there is anything further we should do with the Subcommittee on this criticism. My own inclination would be to do nothing further.

LR Houston